

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Samuel Der-Yeghiayan	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	07 C 4013	DATE	5/25/2011
CASE TITLE	Leon Snipes (B-12804) vs. Eddie Jones, et al.		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below, Petitioner's motion to reconsider [44] is denied.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

This matter is before the court on Petitioner Leon Snipes' (Snipes) *pro se* motion to reconsider. Snipes brought the instant action seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Section 2254 Petition), and on January 23, 2008, the prior judge in this case granted Respondent's motion to dismiss the Section 2254 Petition. Snipes requested a certificate of appealability from the prior judge in this case, and the request was denied on July 11, 2008. Snipes then requested a certificate of appealability from the Seventh Circuit, and the request was denied on October 20, 2008. On February 23, 2011, Snipes filed a *pro se* motion to reinstate and a *pro se* motion for recusal and substitution of judge. On March 24, 2011, this court denied the motion to reinstate and the motion for recusal and substitution of judge. Snipes now requests that the court reconsider its March 24, 2011 ruling.

Snipes contends that he is proceeding without the aid of counsel, but Snipes is not entitled to be represented by counsel in this civil proceeding and he has not shown that an appointment of counsel is warranted. *Forbes v. Edgar*, 112 F.3d 262, 264 (7th Cir. 1997); *Pruitt v. Mote*, 503 F.3d 647, 654, 661 (7th Cir. 2007). In addition, the court accorded all of Snipes' *pro se* filings, including the instant motion, a liberal construction. *See Perruquet v. Briley*, 390 F.3d 505, 512 (7th Cir. 2004)(stating that "[a]s [the plaintiff] was

STATEMENT

<p>without counsel in the district court, his habeas petition is entitled to a liberal construction”); <i>Greer v. Board of Educ. of City of Chicago, Ill.</i>, 267 F.3d 723, 727 (7th Cir. 2001) (indicating that a court should “liberally construe the pleadings of individuals who proceed <i>pro se</i>”). Snipes includes in his instant motion only general statements regarding bias and fairness but Snipes fails to show that this court erred in denying Snipes’ prior motions. Therefore, the motion to reconsider is denied.</p>
